

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/539,808

Applicant(s)

PETEREIT ET AL.

Examiner

H. T. Le

Art Unit

1794

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) H. T. Le. (3) _____.

(2) Jay Rowe, Applicant's Representative. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 29 October 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: References applied in the rejections.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Suggestions were made during the interview for amendment to claims to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112 second paragraph. With regard to the art rejections, Applicant's Representative argued that the Abletshauser reference is not combinable with the teaching in the WO '307 reference because Abletshauser does not permit additional ingredients that may interfere with a crosslinking reaction. The examiner agreed to withdraw the rejection under 35 USC 103, but will maintain the rejection under 35 USC 102 against claim 14..